arXiv:0804.0436v1 [math.DG] 2 Apr 2008

FOUR-DIMENSIONAL OSSERMAN METRICS OF NEUTRAL SIGNATURE

E. GARCÍA-RÍO, P. GILKEY, M. E. VÁZQUEZ-ABAL
AND R. VÁZQUEZ-LORENZO

Abstract. In the algebraic context, we show that null Osserman, spacelike Osserman, and timelike Osserman are equivalent conditions for a model of signature (2,2). We also classify the null Jordan Osserman models of signature (2,2). In the geometric context, we show that a pseudo-Riemannian manifold of signature (2,2) is null Jordan Osserman if and only if either it has constant sectional curvature or it is locally a complex space form.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathcal{M} := (M, g)$ be a pseudo-Riemannian manifold. We say that a tangent vector v is *spacelike*, *timelike*, or *null* if $g(v, v) > 0$, if $g(v, v) < 0$, or if $g(v, v) = 0$, respectively. Geometric properties derived from conditions on spacelike, timelike and null vectors can have quite different meanings. For instance, the notions of spacelike, timelike and null geodesic completeness are non-equivalent and independent conditions. Although spacelike and timelike conditions can sometimes become equivalent (for example as concerns boundedness conditions on the sectional curvature), they can be quite different than similar null conditions, which are sometimes related to the conformal geometry of the manifold.

Let $R(x, y) := \nabla_x\nabla_y - \nabla_y\nabla_x - \nabla_{[x,y]}$ be the curvature operator of $\mathcal{M}$. The associated *Jacobi operator* $\mathcal{J}_R(x) : y \to R(y, x)x$ encodes much geometric information concerning the manifold. One has that $\mathcal{J}_R(\lambda v) = \lambda^2\mathcal{J}_R(v)$; this rescaling property plays a crucial role. Let $S^{\pm}(\mathcal{M})$ be the unit sphere bundles of spacelike and timelike unit tangent vectors in M and let $N(\mathcal{M})$ be the null cone of non-zero null vectors. One says that $\mathcal{M}$ is spacelike (resp. timelike) Osserman if the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{J}_R$ are constant on $S^+(\mathcal{M})$ (resp. on $S^-(\mathcal{M})$). Normalizing the length of the tangent vector to be ±1 takes into account the scaling of the Jacobi operator $\mathcal{J}_R(\lambda v) = \lambda^2\mathcal{J}_R(v)$ noted above. Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, spacelike Osserman and timelike Osserman are equivalent conditions [10, 14].

We shall say that $\mathcal{M}$ is *null Osserman* if the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{J}_R$ are constant on the null cone $N(\mathcal{M})$; with this definition, if $\mathcal{M}$ is null Osserman, then necessarily $\mathcal{J}_R(v)$ is nilpotent if $v \in N(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{J}_R(v)$ has only the eigenvalue 0. Any spacelike or timelike Osserman manifold is necessarily null Osserman; the converse can fail in general – see, for example, [9] in the Lorentzian setting.

The Jordan normal form plays a crucial role in the higher signature setting – a self-adjoint linear transformation need not be determined by its eigenvalues if the metric in question is indefinite. One says that $\mathcal{M}$ is spacelike, timelike, or null Jordan Osserman if the Jordan normal form of $\mathcal{J}_R(\cdot)$ is constant on $S^+(\mathcal{M})$, on $S^-(\mathcal{M})$, or on $N(\mathcal{M})$, respectively. It is known [14, 15, 16] that spacelike and timelike Jordan Osserman are inequivalent conditions; further neither necessarily implies the null Jordan Osserman condition.

Key words and phrases. Spacelike, timelike and null Jacobi operator; Osserman and Jordan Osserman metric; neutral signature (2,2).
2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53C20.

In this paper, we concentrate on the 4-dimensional setting. Chi [5] showed that any Riemannian Osserman 4-manifold is locally isometric to a 2-point homogeneous space; it follows from later work [3, 9] that any Lorentzian 4-manifold has constant sectional curvature. However the situation is much more complicated in neutral signature $(2, 2)$; there exist many examples of nonsymmetric Osserman pseudo-Riemannian manifolds of neutral signature – see [7] and [12]. Indeed, despite the results of [1, 2, 6, 13], the general problem of obtaining a complete description of 4-dimensional Osserman metrics of neutral signature remains open.

It is convenient to work algebraically. Let V be a finite dimensional real vector space which is equipped with a non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ of signature (p, q). Let $A \in \otimes^4(V^*)$ be an algebraic curvature tensor on V, i.e. a tensor which has the symmetries of the Riemann curvature tensor:

$$\begin{aligned}&A(x, y, z, v) = -A(y, x, z, v) = A(z, v, x, y),\\&A(x, y, z, v) + A(y, z, x, v) + A(z, x, y, v) = 0\,.\end{aligned}$$

This defines a model $\mathfrak{M} := (V, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle, A)$. We shall often prove results on the algebraic level (i.e. for models), and then obtain corresponding conclusions in the geometric context. The notions spacelike unit vector, timelike unit vector, null vector, Jacobi operator, etc. extend naturally to this setting.

1.1. Null Osserman algebraic curvature tensors.

Henceforth, let $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ be an inner product of signature $(2, 2)$ on a 4-dimensional real vector space V. Fix an orientation of V and let $\mathcal{B} = \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$ be an oriented orthonormal basis for V where e_1 and e_2 are timelike and where e_3 and e_4 are spacelike.

At the algebraic level, in signature $(2, 2)$ the conditions spacelike Osserman, timelike Osserman, spacelike Jordan Osserman and timelike Jordan Osserman are equivalent to the condition that $\mathfrak{M}$ is Einstein and self-dual with respect to a suitably chosen local orientation [1, 11]. In Section 2, we will establish the following result which shows that these conditions are also equivalent to null Osserman:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathfrak{M}$ be a model of neutral signature $(2, 2)$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *$\mathfrak{M}$ is spacelike Osserman.*
2. *$\mathfrak{M}$ is timelike Osserman.*
3. *$\mathfrak{M}$ is spacelike Jordan Osserman.*
4. *$\mathfrak{M}$ is timelike Jordan Osserman.*
5. *$\mathfrak{M}$ is Einstein and self-dual for a suitably chosen local orientation.*
6. *$\mathfrak{M}$ is null Osserman.*

Remark 1.2. The action of homotheity on the null vectors is a central one in this subject and it is worth saying a few extra words concerning this. With our definition, it is immediate that $\mathfrak{M} = (V, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle, A)$ is null Osserman implies that 0 is the only eigenvalue of $\mathcal{J}_A$ on $N(V, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$. There is, although, an alternate, and different, formulation one could use. One says that $\mathfrak{M}$ is *projectively null Osserman* if either $\mathfrak{M}$ is null Osserman or if given $0 \neq n_1, n_2 \in N(V, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$, there is a non-zero constant λ so that $\operatorname{Spec}(\mathcal{J}_A(n_1)) = \lambda \operatorname{Spec}(\mathcal{J}_A(n_2))$. We refer to [4] for related work; we only introduce this concept for the sake of completeness as it plays no role in our development.

1.2. Null Jordan Osserman algebraic curvature tensors.

There are two algebraic curvature tensors which will play a distinguished role in our development. If Ψ is an anti-symmetric endomorphism of V, define the associated algebraic curvature tensor A^Ψ by setting:

$$A^\Psi(x, y, z, v) := \langle\Psi y, z\rangle\langle\Psi x, v\rangle - \langle\Psi x, z\rangle\langle\Psi y, v\rangle - 2\langle\Psi x, y\rangle\langle\Psi z, v\rangle\,. \tag{1.a}$$

Such tensors span the linear space of all algebraic curvature tensors [8].

The sectional curvature of a non-degenerate 2-plane $\pi = \operatorname{Span}\{x, y\}$ is given by:

$$K_A(\pi) := \frac{A(x,y,y,x)}{\langle x,x\rangle\langle y,y\rangle - \langle x,y\rangle\langle x,y\rangle};$$

A has *constant sectional curvature* κ_0 if and only if $A = \kappa_0 A^0$ where A^0 is the algebraic curvature tensor of constant sectional curvature $+1$ defined by:

$$A^0(x,y,z,v) := \langle y,z\rangle\langle x,v\rangle - \langle x,z\rangle\langle y,v\rangle\,. \tag{1.b}$$

We note for future reference that Equations (1.a) and (1.b) imply that:

$$\mathcal{J}_{A^\Psi}(x) : y \to 3\langle y, \Psi x\rangle \Psi x \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{J}_{A^0}(x) : y \to \langle x,x\rangle y - \langle x,y\rangle x\,. \tag{1.c}$$

Assume that Ψ is skew-adjoint. We say that Ψ is an *orthogonal complex structure* if $\Psi^2 = -\operatorname{id}$ and that Ψ is an *adapted paracomplex structure* if $\Psi^2 = \operatorname{id}$. We say that a triple of skew-adjoint operators $\{\Psi_1, \Psi_2, \Psi_3\}$ is a *paraquaternionic structure* if $\Psi_1^2 = -\operatorname{id}$, $\Psi_2^2 = \operatorname{id}$, $\Psi_3^2 = \operatorname{id}$, and if $\Psi_i\Psi_j + \Psi_j\Psi_i = 0$ for $i \neq j$. We can define a paraquaternionic structure by setting:

$$\begin{array}{llll} \Psi_1 e_1 = -e_2, & \Psi_1 e_2 = e_1, & \Psi_1 e_3 = e_4, & \Psi_1 e_4 = -e_3, \\ \Psi_2 e_1 = e_3, & \Psi_2 e_2 = e_4, & \Psi_2 e_3 = e_1, & \Psi_2 e_4 = e_2, \\ \Psi_3 e_1 = e_4, & \Psi_3 e_2 = -e_3, & \Psi_3 e_3 = -e_2, & \Psi_3 e_4 = e_1. \end{array} \tag{1.d}$$

Note that $\Psi_3 = \Psi_1\Psi_2$. If $\{\bar\Psi_1, \bar\Psi_2, \bar\Psi_3\}$ is any other paraquaternionic structure on V, there exists an isometry ϕ of V so $\phi^*\bar\Psi_1 = \Psi_1$, $\phi^*\bar\Psi_2 = \Psi_2$, and $\phi^*\bar\Psi_3 = \pm\Psi_3$; this slight sign ambiguity will play no role in our constructions.

Let x be a spacelike or timelike vector. Then there is an orthogonal direct sum decomposition $V = x \cdot \mathbb{R} \oplus x^\perp$. Since $\mathcal{J}_A(x)x = 0$, $\mathcal{J}_A(x)$ preserves $x^\perp$. There are four different possibilities which describe the Jordan normal form of $\mathcal{J}_A(x)$ restricted to $x^\perp$, we refer to [2, 11] for further details:

$$\underset{\textit{Type Ia}}{\begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma \end{pmatrix}}, \quad \underset{\textit{Type Ib}}{\begin{pmatrix} \alpha & -\beta & 0 \\ \beta & \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma \end{pmatrix}}, \quad \underset{\textit{Type II}}{\begin{pmatrix} \beta & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \alpha \end{pmatrix}}, \quad \underset{\textit{Type III}}{\begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \alpha \end{pmatrix}}. \tag{1.e}$$

Type Ia corresponds to a diagonalizable operator, Type Ib to an operator with a complex eigenvalue and Type II (resp. Type III) to a double (resp. triple) root of the minimal polynomial of the operator. If $\mathfrak{M}$ is spacelike, timelike, or null Osserman, then the Jordan normal form of $\mathcal{J}_A$ is constant on the spacelike and timelike unit vectors and we classify A according to the 4-Types above. In Section 3, we construct, up to isomorphism, all the spacelike Jordan Osserman algebraic curvature tensors and perform the analysis necessary to establish the following classification result:

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\mathfrak{M} := (V, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle, A)$ be a model of signature $(2,2)$. Then $\mathfrak{M}$ is null Jordan Osserman if and only if A is of Type Ia and one of the following holds:*

1. *There exists a constant κ_0 so that $A = \kappa_0 A^0$.*
2. *There exists constants κ_0 and κ_J with $\kappa_J \neq 0$ so that $A = \kappa_0 A^0 + \kappa_J A^J$ where J is an orthogonal complex structure on V.*
3. *There exists a constant $\kappa_P \neq 0$ so that $A = \kappa_P A^P$ where P is an adapted paracomplex structure on Vt.*
4. *There exist constants $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3$ so that $\kappa_2\kappa_3(\kappa_2 + \kappa_1)(\kappa_3 + \kappa_1) > 0$, so that the associated eigenvalues $\{3\kappa_1, -3\kappa_2, -3\kappa_3\}$ are all distinct, and so that $A = \kappa_1 A^{\Psi_1} + \kappa_2 A^{\Psi_2} + \kappa_3 A^{\Psi_3}$ where (Ψ_1, Ψ_2, Ψ_3) is a paraquaternionic structure on V.*

Remark 1.4. The inequality $\kappa_2\kappa_3(\kappa_2 + \kappa_1)(\kappa_3 + \kappa_1) > 0$ is equivalent to the fact that the cross ratio

$$(0, \kappa_1, -\kappa_3, -\kappa_2) = \frac{\kappa_3(\kappa_2 + \kappa_1)}{\kappa_2(\kappa_3 + \kappa_1)} > 0.$$

Let $\mathbb{S}^2$ be the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^3$. This inequality is equivalent to the fact that the set of points $(0, -\kappa_3, -\kappa_2)$ and $(\kappa_1, -\kappa_3, -\kappa_2)$ give the corresponding circles in $\mathbb{S}^2$ (via the stereographic projection) the same orientation [17].

1.3. **Null Jordan Osserman manifolds.** We characterize those neutral signature 4-manifolds which are null Jordan Osserman; null Osserman and null Jordan Osserman are not equivalent conditions as the analysis of Section 3.4 shows. We say that $\mathcal{M}$ is locally a complex space form if it is an indefinite Kähler manifold of constant holomorphic sectional curvature. We will use Theorem 1.3 to establish the following geometric result in Section 4:

Theorem 1.5. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a connected pseudo-Riemannian manifold of neutral signature $(2,2)$. Then $\mathcal{M}$ is null Jordan Osserman if and only either $\mathcal{M}$ has constant sectional curvature or $\mathcal{M}$ is locally a complex space form.*

Remark 1.6. Recall that there is another family of four-dimensional Osserman manifolds with diagonalizable Jacobi operator: the paracomplex space forms [2]. Although the geometry of complex and paracomplex space forms is very similar, the Jordan-Osserman condition distinguishes them. So far, up to our knowledge, this is the first algebraic curvature condition which distinguishes between these two geometries.

2. NULL OSSERMAN MODELS OF SIGNATURE $(2,2)$

We will work in the algebraic context to prove Theorem 1.1. Here is a brief outline to this section. Previous work establishes that Assertions (1)-(5) are equivalent. In Section 2.1, we introduce various notational conventions and show that spacelike Osserman models are null Osserman and that null Osserman models are Einstein. Thus to complete the proof, it suffices to show null Osserman models are self-dual or anti-self-dual. In Section 2.2, we examine Einstein models. Lemma 2.2 describes the Weyl curvature operators in that setting and Lemma 2.3 gives an alternate characterization of self-duality for an Einstein model. We use Lemma 2.3 to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Section 2.3.

2.1. **Notational conventions.** Let $\mathfrak{M} := (V, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle, A)$ be a neutral signature 4-dimensional model. We use the inner product to raise indices and to define an associated Jacobi operator $\mathcal{J}_A$, which is characterized by the identity:

$$\langle \mathcal{J}_A(x)y, z\rangle = A(y, x, x, z)\,.$$

Let $\mathcal{B} = \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$ be an oriented orthonormal basis for V. Let $g_{ij} := \langle e_i, e_j\rangle$ and let g^{ij} be the inverse matrix. The associated *Ricci tensor* ρ_A, the *scalar curvature* τ_A, and the *Weyl tensor* W_A are then defined by setting:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho_A(x,y) := \sum_{i,j=1}^{4} g^{ij} A(e_i, x, y, e_j), \quad \tau_A := \sum_{i,j=1}^{4} g^{ij} \rho_A(e_i, e_j),\\
&W_A(x,y,z,v) := A(x,y,z,v) + \tfrac{1}{6}\tau_A\{\langle y,z\rangle\langle x,v\rangle - \langle x,z\rangle\langle y,v\rangle\}\\
&\quad -\tfrac{1}{2}\{\rho_A(y,z)\langle x,v\rangle - \rho_A(x,z)\langle y,v\rangle\\
&\qquad +\rho_A(x,v)\langle y,z\rangle - \rho_A(y,v)\langle x,z\rangle\}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $A_{ijkl} = A^{\mathcal{B}}_{ijkl} := A(e_i, e_j, e_k, e_l)$ denote the components of A with respect to $\mathcal{B}$ where $1 \le i,j,k,l \le 4$; we shall drop the dependence on $\mathcal{B}$ from the notation when there is no danger of confusion. Let $\{e^1, ..., e^4\}$ be the dual basis for V^*. The Hodge operator $\star : \Lambda^p(V^*) \to \Lambda^{4-p}(V^*)$ is characterized by the identity:

$$\phi_p \wedge \star\theta_p = \langle \phi_p, \theta_p\rangle e^1 \wedge e^2 \wedge e^3 \wedge e^4\,.$$

Thus, in particular,

$$\begin{array}{lll} \star(e^1\wedge e^2)=e^3\wedge e^4, & \star(e^1\wedge e^3)=e^2\wedge e^4, & \star(e^1\wedge e^4)=-e^2\wedge e^3,\\ \star(e^2\wedge e^3)=-e^1\wedge e^4, & \star(e^2\wedge e^4)=e^1\wedge e^3, & \star(e^3\wedge e^4)=e^1\wedge e^2\,. \end{array}$$

A crucial feature of 4-dimensional geometry now enters. Since $\star^2=\mathrm{id}$, $\star$ induces a splitting of the space of 2-forms $\Lambda^2(V^*)=\Lambda^+\oplus\Lambda^-$, where Λ^+ and Λ^- denote the spaces of *self-dual* and *anti-self-dual* two-forms

$$\Lambda^+=\{\alpha\in\Lambda^2:\star\alpha=\alpha\},\qquad \Lambda^-=\{\alpha\in\Lambda^2:\star\alpha=-\alpha\}.$$

We have orthonormal bases $\{E_1^{\mp},E_2^{\mp},E_3^{\mp}\}$ for $\Lambda^{\mp}$ which are given by:

$$\begin{array}{ll} E_1^{\mp}=\frac{1}{\sqrt2}(e^1\wedge e^2\mp e^3\wedge e^4), & E_2^{\mp}=\frac{1}{\sqrt2}(e^1\wedge e^3\mp e^2\wedge e^4),\\ E_3^{\mp}=\frac{1}{\sqrt2}(e^1\wedge e^4\pm e^2\wedge e^3), & \end{array}$$

where the induced inner product on $\Lambda^{\mp}$ has signature $(2,1)$:

$$\langle E_1^{\mp},E_1^{\mp}\rangle=1,\quad \langle E_2^{\mp},E_2^{\mp}\rangle=-1,\quad \langle E_3^{\mp},E_3^{\mp}\rangle=-1\,.$$

Let $W_A^{\mp}$ be the restriction of W_A to the spaces $\Lambda^{\mp}$; $W_A^{\mp}:\Lambda^{\mp}\longrightarrow\Lambda^{\mp}$. Then $\mathfrak{M}$ is said to be *self-dual* (resp., *anti-self-dual*) if $W_A^-=0$ (resp. if $W_A^+=0$).

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mathfrak{M}=(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle,A)$ be a model of signature $(2,2)$.*

1. *If $\mathfrak{M}$ is spacelike Osserman, then $\mathfrak{M}$ is null Osserman.*
2. *If $\mathfrak{M}$ is null Osserman, then $\mathfrak{M}$ is Einstein.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{M}$ be spacelike Osserman. Set $T_j(v):=\mathrm{Tr}\{\mathcal{J}_A(v)^j\}$. Since the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{J}_A$ are constant on $S^+(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$, there are constants c_j so that $T_j(v)=c_j$ for $v\in S^+(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$. Since $T_j(\lambda v)=\lambda^{2j}T_j(v)$, we have $T_j(v)=c_j\langle v,v\rangle^j$ for v spacelike. Since the spacelike vectors form an open subset of V, this polynomial identity holds for all $v\in V$. Thus, in particular, $T_j(v)=0$ if $v\in N(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$. This implies that 0 is the only eigenvalue of $\mathcal{J}_A(v)$ and shows $\mathfrak{M}$ is null Osserman.

Suppose that $\mathfrak{M}$ is null Osserman. Let s_1 and s_2 be spacelike unit vectors. We may choose a unit timelike vector t which is perpendicular to s_1 and s_2. Let $n_i^{\pm}:=s_i\pm t$ be null vectors. Thus $0=\mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{J}_A(n_i^{\pm}))=\rho_A(n_i^{\pm},n_i^{\pm})$, and

$$0=\rho_A(s_i\pm t,s_i\pm t)=\rho_A(s_i,s_i)+\rho_A(t,t)\pm2\rho_A(s_i,t)\,.$$

This implies $\rho_A(s_i,t)=0$ and $\rho_A(s_i,s_i)+\rho_A(t,t)=0$; in particular, one has that $\rho_A(s_1,s_1)=-\rho_A(t,t)=\rho_A(s_2,s_2)$. Consequently, after rescaling, there is a constant c so $\rho_A(s,s)=c\langle s,s\rangle$ for every spacelike vector s; this polynomial identity then continues to hold for all $s\in V$. Polarizing this identity then yields $\rho_A=c\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ and hence $\mathfrak{M}$ is Einstein. □

2.2. **The Weyl tensor for an Einstein algebraic curvature tensor.** Let

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1&=2A_{1212}+3\varepsilon A_{1234}+A_{1313}+A_{1414},\\ \sigma_2&=A_{1212}+2A_{1313}+3\varepsilon A_{1324}-A_{1414},\\ \sigma_3&=A_{1212}+3\varepsilon A_{1234}-A_{1313}-3\varepsilon A_{1324}+2A_{1414}\,. \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma is now immediate:

Lemma 2.2. *If $\mathfrak{M}$ is Einstein, then the self-dual Weyl curvature operator W_A^+ ($\varepsilon=1$) and the anti-self-dual Weyl curvature operator W_A^- ($\varepsilon=-1$) are given by:*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\sigma_1}{3} & A_{1213}+\varepsilon A_{1224} & A_{1214}-\varepsilon A_{1223}\\ -A_{1213}-\varepsilon A_{1224} & -\frac{\sigma_2}{3} & -A_{1314}+\varepsilon A_{1323}\\ -A_{1214}+\varepsilon A_{1223} & -A_{1314}+\varepsilon A_{1323} & -\frac{\sigma_3}{3} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We now come to an observation which is of interest in its own right:

Lemma 2.3. *If $\mathfrak{M}$ is Einstein, then the model $\mathfrak{M}$ is anti-self-dual if and only if $A^{\mathcal{B}}_{1214}-A^{\mathcal{B}}_{1223}=0$ for every oriented orthonormal frame $\mathcal{B}$.*

Proof. If $\mathfrak{M}$ is anti-self-dual, we set $\varepsilon=1$ in Lemma 2.2 to see $A^{\mathcal{B}}_{1214}-A^{\mathcal{B}}_{1223}=0$. Conversely, suppose $A^{\mathcal{B}}_{1214}-A^{\mathcal{B}}_{1223}=0$ for every $\mathcal{B}$. Define a new basis $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ by setting $\tilde e_1=e_1$, $\tilde e_2=e_2$, $\tilde e_3=e_4$, and $\tilde e_4=-e_3$. We then have

$$0=-A^{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}_{1214}+A^{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}_{1223}=A^{\mathcal{B}}_{1213}+A^{\mathcal{B}}_{1224}\,.$$

Next, define $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ by setting $\tilde e_1=e_1$, $\tilde e_2=\cosh\theta e_2+\sinh\theta e_3$, $\tilde e_3=\sinh\theta e_2+\cosh\theta e_3$, and $\tilde e_4=e_4$. This yields the relation:

$$0=-A^{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}_{1214}+A^{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}_{1223}=\cosh\theta\{-A^{\mathcal{B}}_{1214}+A^{\mathcal{B}}_{1223}\}+\sinh\theta\{-A^{\mathcal{B}}_{1314}+A^{\mathcal{B}}_{1323}\}\,.$$

This shows $-A^{\mathcal{B}}_{1314}+A^{\mathcal{B}}_{1323}=0$. Thus, by Lemma 2.2,

$$W_A^+=\frac{1}{3}\left(\begin{array}{lll}\sigma_1^{\mathcal{B}} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & -\sigma_2^{\mathcal{B}} & 0\\ 0 & 0 & -\sigma_3^{\mathcal{B}}\end{array}\right).$$

Again setting $\tilde e_1=e_1$, $\tilde e_2=\cosh\theta e_2+\sinh\theta e_3$, $\tilde e_3=\sinh\theta e_2+\cosh\theta e_3$, and $\tilde e_4=e_4$ yields bases for $\Lambda^\pm$ in the form

$$\tilde E_1^\pm=\cosh\theta E_1^\pm+\sinh\theta E_2^\pm,\quad \tilde E_2^\pm=\cosh\theta E_2^\pm+\sinh\theta E_1^\pm,\quad \tilde E_3^\pm=E_3^\pm\,.$$

We may compute

$$\begin{array}{rcl}W_A^+\tilde E_1^+ &=& \sigma_1^{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}\tilde E_1^+=\sigma_1^{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}(\cosh\theta E_1^++\sinh\theta E_2^+)\\ &=& W_A^+(\cosh\theta E_1^++\sinh\theta E_2^+)=\sigma_1^{\mathcal{B}}\cosh\theta E_1^+-\sigma_2^{\mathcal{B}}\sinh\theta E_2^+\,.\end{array}$$

This shows $\sigma_1^{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}=\sigma_1^{\mathcal{B}}=-\sigma_2^{\mathcal{B}}$. A similar argument applied to the basis $\tilde e_1=e_1$, $\tilde e_2=\cosh\theta e_2+\sinh\theta e_4$, $\tilde e_3=e_3$, and $\tilde e_4=\sinh\theta e_2+\cosh\theta e_4$ yields $\sigma_1^{\mathcal{B}}=-\sigma_3^{\mathcal{B}}$. Since $\sigma_1^{\mathcal{B}}-\sigma_2^{\mathcal{B}}-\sigma_3^{\mathcal{B}}=0$, it now follows that $W_A^+=0$. □

2.3. **The proof of Theorem 1.1.** Let $\mathfrak{M}$ be a null Osserman model. By Lemma 2.1, $\mathfrak{M}$ is Einstein. We complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 by showing $\mathfrak{M}$ is self-dual or anti-self-dual. Suppose the contrary and argue for a contradiction. As $\mathfrak{M}$ is null Osserman, $\mathcal{J}_A$ is nilpotent so the characteristic polynomial $p_\lambda(\mathcal{J}_A(u))=\lambda^4$. Let

$$\begin{array}{l}\mathcal{E}_1:=A_{1212}+2A_{1214}-2A_{1223}+2A_{1234}-A_{1324}+A_{1414},\\ Q(a,b):=(A_{1212}-2A_{1214}-2A_{1223}-2A_{1234}+A_{1324}+A_{1414})a^4\\ \quad+(A_{1212}+2A_{1214}+2A_{1223}-2A_{1234}+A_{1324}+A_{1414})b^4\\ \quad+2(A_{1212}+2A_{1313}-3A_{1324}-A_{1414})a^2b^2\\ \quad+4(A_{1213}-A_{1224}-A_{1314}-A_{1323})a^3b\\ \quad+4(A_{1213}-A_{1224}+A_{1314}+A_{1323})ab^3.\end{array}$$

If we take $u=ae_1+be_2+ae_3+be_4$, then we have

$$\lambda^4=p_\lambda(\mathcal{J}_A(u))=\lambda^2\left(\lambda^2-Q(a,b)\mathcal{E}_1\right)\,.$$

As $p_\lambda(\mathcal{J}_A(u))=\lambda^4$, either $Q(a,b)=0$ or $\mathcal{E}_1=0$. If we suppose that $\mathcal{E}_1\neq0$, we then have $Q(a,b)$ vanishes identically for all a,b. This leads to the relations:

$$\begin{array}{l}A_{1213}-A_{1224}=0,\quad A_{1214}+A_{1223}=0,\quad A_{1314}+A_{1323}=0,\\ A_{1234}+A_{1313}-2A_{1324}-A_{1414}=0,\quad A_{1212}+2A_{1313}-3A_{1324}-A_{1414}=0\,.\end{array}$$

From this, we see that the matrix in Lemma 2.2 vanishes for $\varepsilon=-1$. This means that the anti-self-dual Weyl curvature operator W_A^- vanishes so $\mathfrak{M}$ is self-dual. This is contrary to our assumption. Thus for **any** oriented orthonormal frame we have

$$0=A_{1212}+2A_{1214}-2A_{1223}+2A_{1234}-A_{1324}+A_{1414}\,.\tag{2.a}$$

Setting $\tilde e_1=-e_1$, $\tilde e_2=e_2$, $\tilde e_3=e_3$, and $\tilde e_4=-e_4$ yields

$$0=A_{1212}-2A_{1214}+2A_{1223}+2A_{1234}-A_{1324}+A_{1414}\,.\tag{2.b}$$

Subtracting Equation (2.b) from Equation (2.a) then yields the relation

$$0=-A_{1214}+A_{1223}\,.$$

We may now use Lemma 2.3 to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

3. The proof of Theorem 1.3

Here is a brief outline to this section. In Section 3.1, we construct, up to isomorphism, all spacelike Jordan Osserman models of signature $(2,2)$. In the remainder of Section 3, we analyze each possible Jordan normal form in some detail using the classification of Equation (1.e). Sections 3.2-3.5 deal with Type Ia models. In Section 3.2 we study the case when all the eigenvalues are equal; this gives rise to Theorem 1.3 (1). In Section 3.3, we study the case of two equal spacelike eigenvalues, and in Section 3.4, we study equal timelike and spacelike eigenvalues; these involve Theorem 1.3 (2) and (3), respectively. In Section 3.5, we study Type Ia models with distinct eigenvalues; this leads to Theorem 1.3 (4). We complete the proof of Theorem 1.3 by showing the remaining Types do not give rise to null Jordan Osserman models. Type Ib models are studied in Section 3.6, Type II models are studied in Section 3.7, and Type III models are studied in Section 3.8.

3.1. **Spacelike Jordan Osserman models.** We use the ansatz from [16]. Let $\{\Psi_1,\Psi_2,\Psi_3\}$ be the paraquaternionic structure given in Equation (1.d). Let $\xi_{ij}\in\mathbb{R}$ for $1\le i\le j\le 3$ and let $\kappa_0\in\mathbb{R}$ be given. Let

$$\begin{aligned}(3.a)\quad A_{\kappa_0,\xi} :=\ & \kappa_0A^0+\tfrac13\xi_{11}A^{\Psi_1}+\tfrac13\xi_{22}A^{\Psi_2}+\tfrac13\xi_{33}A^{\Psi_3}\\ &+\tfrac13\xi_{12}A^{\Psi_1+\Psi_2}+\tfrac13\xi_{13}A^{\Psi_1+\Psi_3}+\tfrac13\xi_{23}A^{\Psi_2+\Psi_3},\\ \mathcal{J}_{\kappa_0,\xi} :=\ & \kappa_0\,\mathrm{id}+\begin{pmatrix}\xi_{11}+\xi_{12}+\xi_{13} & -\xi_{12} & -\xi_{13}\\ \xi_{12} & -\xi_{22}-\xi_{12}-\xi_{23} & -\xi_{23}\\ \xi_{13} & -\xi_{23} & -\xi_{33}-\xi_{13}-\xi_{23}\end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.1. *Adopt the notation established above. Let* $\mathfrak{M}_{\kappa_0,\xi}:=(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle,A_{\kappa_0,\xi})$.

1. *If* $x\in S^\pm(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$, *then* $\mathcal{J}_{A_{\kappa_0,\xi}}(x)$ *is conjugate to the matrix* $\pm\mathcal{J}_{\kappa_0,\xi}$.
2. *The model* $\mathfrak{M}_{\kappa_0,\xi}$ *is spacelike and timelike Jordan Osserman.*
3. *Let* $\mathfrak{M}_i=(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle,A_i)$ *be spacelike Osserman models of signature* $(2,2)$. *If* $\mathcal{J}_{A_1}(x)$ *is conjugate to* $\mathcal{J}_{A_2}(x)$ *for some* $x\in S^\pm(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$, *then there exists an isometry* ϕ *of* $(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$ *so that* $\phi^*A_2=A_1$.

Remark 3.2. Since any self-adjoint map of a signature $(2,1)$ vector space is conjugate to $\mathcal{J}_{\kappa_0,\xi}$ for some $\{\kappa_0,\xi\}$, every spacelike Osserman model of signature $(2,2)$ is isomorphic to one given by Equation (3.a).

Proof. We suppose x is a spacelike unit vector as the timelike case is similar. Let $f_1:=\Psi_1x$, $f_2:=\Psi_2x$, and $f_3:=\Psi_3x$. Then $\{f_1,f_2,f_3\}$ is an orthonormal basis of signature $(+,-,-)$ for $x^\perp$. Let $\mathcal{J}:=\mathcal{J}_{A_{\kappa_0,\xi}}(x)$. We use Equation (1.c) to see:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}f_1&=(\kappa_0+\xi_{11}+\xi_{12}+\xi_{13})f_1+\xi_{12}f_2+\xi_{13}f_3,\\ \mathcal{J}f_2&=-\xi_{12}f_1+(\kappa_0-\xi_{22}-\xi_{12}-\xi_{23})f_2-\xi_{23}f_3,\\ \mathcal{J}f_3&=-\xi_{13}f_1-\xi_{23}f_2+(\kappa_0-\xi_{33}-\xi_{13}-\xi_{23})f_3\,.\end{aligned}$$

Assertion (1) now follows; Assertion (2) follows from Assertion (1). Suppose that $\mathfrak{M}$ is a Type Ia spacelike Osserman model so $\mathcal{J}_A(x)=\mathrm{diag}[\alpha,\beta,\gamma]$ for any x in $S^+(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$; choose the notation so $\mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{J}_A(x)-\alpha\,\mathrm{id})$ is spacelike. It then follows from the discussion in [2, 11] that there exists an orthonormal basis $\mathcal{B}$ so that the non-zero components of the curvature tensor are given by:

$$\begin{aligned}&A_{1221}=A_{4334}=\alpha, && A_{1331}=A_{2442}=-\beta,\\ &A_{1441}=A_{3223}=-\gamma, && A_{1234}=(-2\alpha+\beta+\gamma)/3,\\ &A_{1423}=(\alpha+\beta-2\gamma)/3, && A_{1342}=(\alpha-2\beta+\gamma)/3\,.\end{aligned}$$

Similar forms exist for the other Types of Equation (1.e). Thus the Jordan normal form of $\mathcal{J}_A(x)$ determines A up to the action of $O(2,2)$. Assertion (3) follows. $\square$

The following observation is immediate:

Lemma 3.3. *A null Osserman model* $\mathfrak{M}$ *of signature* $(2,2)$ *is null Jordan Osserman if and only if the functions* $\operatorname{Rank}\{\mathcal{J}_A(\cdot)\}$ *and* $\operatorname{Rank}\{\mathcal{J}_A(\cdot)^2\}$ *are constant on* $N(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$.

3.2. **Type Ia with all eigenvalues equal** $[\alpha=\beta=\gamma]$**.** We set $A=\kappa_0A^0$. By Lemma 3.1, the Jordan normal form is given by $\operatorname{diag}[\kappa_0,\kappa_0,\kappa_0]$. If $v\in N(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$, then $\mathcal{J}_A(v)y=-\kappa_0\langle v,y\rangle v$ and hence $\mathfrak{M}$ is null Jordan Osserman.

3.3. **Type Ia with two equal spacelike eigenvalues** $[\beta=\gamma,\ \alpha\neq\beta]$**.** Let J be an orthogonal almost complex structure on V and let $A=\kappa_0A^0+\kappa_JA^J$. The Jordan normal form is then given by $\operatorname{diag}[\kappa_0+3\kappa_J,\kappa_0,\kappa_0]$ which has the desired form for suitably chosen κ_0 and κ_J with $\kappa_J\neq0$. Let $v\in N(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$. We have

$$\mathcal{J}_A(v)y=-\kappa_0\langle v,y\rangle v+3\kappa_J\langle y,Jv\rangle Jv\,.$$

Because $J^2=-\operatorname{id}$, v and Jv are linearly independent vectors. We note that $\langle v,v\rangle=\langle v,Jv\rangle=\langle Jv,Jv\rangle=0$. Consequently $\mathcal{J}_A(v)v=\mathcal{J}_A(v)Jv=0$. Since $v^\perp$ and $Jv^\perp$ are distinct 3-dimensional subspaces, we can choose y so $\langle v,y\rangle=1$ and $\langle Jv,y\rangle=0$. It now follows that $\mathcal{J}_A(v)y=-\kappa_0v$ while $\mathcal{J}_A(v)Jy=3\kappa_JJv$. Thus $\mathcal{J}_A(v)$ has rank 2 and $\mathcal{J}_A(v)^2=0$. This implies A is null Jordan Osserman.

3.4. **Type Ia with equal timelike and spacelike eigenvalues** $[\alpha=\beta,\ \beta\neq\gamma]$**.** Let $A=\kappa_0A^0+\kappa_PA^P$ where $\kappa_P\neq0$ and where P is an adapted paracomplex structure; the Jordan normal form is then given by $\operatorname{diag}[\kappa_0,\kappa_0-3\kappa_P,\kappa_0]$ which has the desired form for suitably chosen parameters. If $v\in N(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$, then

$$\mathcal{J}_A(v)y=-\kappa_0\langle v,y\rangle v+3\kappa_P\langle y,Pv\rangle Pv\,.$$

If $\kappa_0=0$, $\mathfrak{M}$ is null Jordan Osserman. Suppose $\kappa_0\neq0$. If $v=e_1+Pe_1$, then $Pv=v$ so $\operatorname{Rank}\{\mathcal{J}_A(v)\}\leq1$. On the other hand, if $v=e_1+e_4$, then v and Pv are linearly independent so $\operatorname{Rank}\{\mathcal{J}_A(v)\}=2$ and $\mathfrak{M}$ is not null Jordan Osserman.

3.5. **Type Ia with three distinct eigenvalues.** Let $A:=\sum_i\kappa_iA^{\Psi_i}$ where $\{\Psi_1,\Psi_2,\Psi_3\}$ is the paraquaternionic structure of Equation (1.d); the Jordan normal form is given by $\operatorname{diag}[3\kappa_1,-3\kappa_2,-3\kappa_3]$ which has the desired form for suitably chosen parameters with

$$\kappa_1+\kappa_2\neq0,\quad \kappa_1+\kappa_3\neq0,\quad \kappa_2-\kappa_3\neq0\,.$$

Let $\tilde e\in S^+(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$, let $V_+:=\operatorname{Span}\{\tilde e,\Psi^1\tilde e\}$, and let $V_-=V_+^\perp=\operatorname{Span}\{\Psi_2\tilde e,\Psi_3\tilde e\}$. We then have an orthogonal direct sum decomposition $V=V_-\oplus V_+$ where V_+ is spacelike and V_- is timelike. Decompose $v\in N(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$ in the form $v=\lambda(e_++e_-)$ where $e_\pm\in V_\pm$. Let $\mathfrak{M}$ be spacelike Osserman. We have $\mathcal{J}_A(v)=\lambda^2\mathcal{J}_A(e_++e_-)$. Since $\mathcal{J}_A(v)$ is nilpotent, $\mathcal{J}_A(v)$ and $\mathcal{J}_A(e_++e_-)$ have the same Jordan normal form. Thus we may safely take $\lambda=1$ so $v=e_++e_-$. Set $e=e_+$ and expand $e_-=\cos\theta\Psi_2e+\sin\theta\Psi_3e$. This expresses

$$v=e+\cos\theta\Psi_2e+\sin\theta\Psi_3e\quad\text{for}\quad e\in S^+(V,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)\,.$$

We use the relations $\Psi_1\Psi_2=\Psi_3$, $\Psi_1\Psi_3=-\Psi_2$, and $\Psi_2\Psi_3=-\Psi_1$ to see

$$\begin{array}{rrrrr}\Psi_1v= & 0 & +\Psi_1e & -\sin\theta\Psi_2e & +\cos\theta\Psi_3e,\\ \Psi_2v= & \cos\theta e & -\sin\theta\Psi_1e & +\Psi_2e & +0,\\ \Psi_3v= & \sin\theta e & +\cos\theta\Psi_1e & +0 & +\Psi_3e,\\ \multicolumn{5}{l}{0=\Psi_1v+\sin\theta\Psi_2v-\cos\theta\Psi_3v\,.}\end{array}\tag{3.b}$$

This shows that the vectors $\{\Psi_1v,\Psi_2v,\Psi_3v\}$ span a 2-dimensional subspace. As $\langle\Psi_iv,\Psi_jv\rangle=0$, $\operatorname{Span}\{\Psi_iv\}\subset\operatorname{Ker}\{\mathcal{J}_A(v)\}$. As $\operatorname{Range}\{\mathcal{J}_A(v)\}\subset\operatorname{Span}\{\Psi_iv\}$,

$$\operatorname{Rank}\{\mathcal{J}_A(v)\}\leq2\quad\text{and}\quad\mathcal{J}_A(v)^2=0\,.$$

Note that $\{e, \Psi_1 e, \Psi_2 v, \Psi_3 v\}$ is a basis for V. Let π_+ denote orthogonal projection on $V_+ = \operatorname{Span}\{e, \Psi_1 e\}$. As π_+ is injective on $\operatorname{Range}\{\mathcal{J}_A(v)\} \subset \operatorname{Span}\{\Psi_2 v, \Psi_3 v\}$,

$$r(v) := \dim \operatorname{Range}\{\mathcal{J}_A(v)\} = \dim\{\operatorname{Span}\{\pi_+\mathcal{J}_A(v)e, \pi_+\mathcal{J}_A(v)\Psi_1 e\}\}\,.$$

By Equation (3.b),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{J}_A(v)e = 3\kappa_2\cos\theta\Psi_2 v + 3\kappa_3\sin\theta\Psi_3 v,\\
&\mathcal{J}_A(v)\Psi_1 e = 3\kappa_1\Psi_1 v - 3\kappa_2\sin\theta\Psi_2 v + 3\kappa_3\cos\theta\Psi_3 v,\\
&\pi_+\mathcal{J}_A(v)e = 3\{\kappa_2\cos\theta(\cos\theta) + \kappa_3\sin\theta(\sin\theta)\}e\\
&\qquad +3\{\kappa_2\cos\theta(-\sin\theta) + \kappa_3\sin\theta(\cos\theta)\}\Psi_1 e,\\
&\pi_+\mathcal{J}_A(v)\Psi_1 e = 3\{-\kappa_2\sin\theta(\cos\theta) + \kappa_3\cos\theta(\sin\theta)\}e\\
&\qquad +3\{\kappa_1 - \kappa_2\sin\theta(-\sin\theta) + \kappa_3\cos\theta(\cos\theta)\}\Psi_1 e\,.
\end{aligned}$$

This leads to a coefficient matrix for $\pi_+\mathcal{J}_A(v)$ on V_+ given by

$$\mathcal{C}_A(\theta) = 3\begin{pmatrix} \kappa_2\cos^2\theta + \kappa_3\sin^2\theta & (-\kappa_2+\kappa_3)\sin\theta\cos\theta \\ (-\kappa_2+\kappa_3)\sin\theta\cos\theta & \kappa_1 + \kappa_2\sin^2\theta + \kappa_3\cos^2\theta \end{pmatrix}.$$

We compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{1}{9}\det(\mathcal{C}_A)(\theta) &= \kappa_1\kappa_2\cos^2\theta + \kappa_2^2\cos^2\theta\sin^2\theta + \kappa_2\kappa_3\cos^4\theta\\
&+ \kappa_1\kappa_3\sin^2\theta + \kappa_2\kappa_3\sin^4\theta + \kappa_3^2\sin^2\theta\cos^2\theta\\
&- \kappa_2^2\sin^2\theta\cos^2\theta - \kappa_3^2\sin^2\theta\cos^2\theta + 2\kappa_2\kappa_3\sin^2\theta\cos^2\theta\\
&= \kappa_1\kappa_2\cos^2\theta + \kappa_1\kappa_3\sin^2\theta + \kappa_2\kappa_3\\
&= (\kappa_1+\kappa_3)\kappa_2\cos^2\theta + (\kappa_1+\kappa_2)\kappa_3\sin^2\theta\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\kappa_2\kappa_3 = 0$ implies that $\det(\mathcal{C}_A)(\theta)$ vanishes for some θ and thus $\mathfrak{M}$ is not null Jordan Osserman. Hence, since $(\kappa_1+\kappa_3)\kappa_2$ and $(\kappa_1+\kappa_2)\kappa_3$ are non-zero, $\det(\mathcal{C}_A)(\theta)$ never vanishes, or equivalently $\mathfrak{M}$ is null Jordan Osserman, if and only if these two real numbers have the same sign, i.e. $\kappa_2\kappa_3(\kappa_1+\kappa_3)(\kappa_1+\kappa_2) > 0$.

3.6. **Type Ib models.** Let $b \neq 0$. We take a curvature tensor of the form:

$$A = \tfrac{1}{3}\{(a-b)A^{\Psi_1} + (-b-a)A^{\Psi_2} + bA^{\Psi_1+\Psi_2} + cA^{\Psi_3}\}\,.$$

Proceeding as in the previous case, we have for any $e \in S^+(V, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$ that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{J}_A(x)y = \langle(a\Psi_1 + b\Psi_2)x, y\rangle\Psi_1 x + \langle(b\Psi_1 - a\Psi_2)x, y\rangle\Psi_2 x + c\langle\Psi_3 x, y\rangle\Psi_3 x,\\
&\mathcal{J}_A(e)\Psi_1 e = a\Psi_1 e + b\Psi_2 e,\ \mathcal{J}_A(e)\Psi_2 e = -b\Psi_1 e + a\Psi_2 e,\ \mathcal{J}_A(e)\Psi_3 e = -c\Psi_3 e\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\mathfrak{M} := (V, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle, A)$ is Type Ib and any Type Ib model is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{M}$ for suitably chosen parameters. As in Section 3.5, put $v = e + \cos\theta\Psi_2 e + \sin\theta\Psi_3 e$. We compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{J}_A(v)e = b\cos\theta\Psi_1 v - a\cos\theta\Psi_2 v + c\sin\theta\Psi_3 v,\\
&\mathcal{J}_A(v)\Psi_1 e = (a - b\sin\theta)\Psi_1 v + (b + a\sin\theta)\Psi_2 v + c\cos\theta\Psi_3 v,\\
&\pi_+\mathcal{J}_A(v)e = \{-a\cos\theta(\cos\theta) + c\sin\theta(\sin\theta)\}e\\
&\quad +\{b\cos\theta - a\cos\theta(-\sin\theta) + c\sin\theta(\cos\theta)\}\Psi_1 e,\\
&\pi_+\mathcal{J}_A(v)\Psi_1 e = \{(b + a\sin\theta)(\cos\theta) + c\cos\theta(\sin\theta)\}e\\
&\quad +\{(a - b\sin\theta) + (b + a\sin\theta)(-\sin\theta) + c\cos\theta(\cos\theta)\}\Psi_1 e.
\end{aligned}$$

The coefficient matrix for $\pi_+\mathcal{J}_A(v)$ on V_+ is then given by

$$\mathcal{C}_A(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} -a\cos^2\theta + c\sin^2\theta & b\cos\theta + (a+c)\sin\theta\cos\theta \\ b\cos\theta + (a+c)\sin\theta\cos\theta & -2b\sin\theta + (a+c)\cos^2\theta \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have $\det(\mathcal{C}_A)(\frac{\pi}{2}) = -2bc$, $\det(\mathcal{C}_A)(-\frac{\pi}{2}) = 2bc$. If $c \neq 0$, then these signs differ and hence $\det(\mathcal{C}_A)(\theta) = 0$ for some $-\frac{\pi}{2} < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\mathfrak{M}$ is not null Jordan Osserman. If $c = 0$, then $\det(\mathcal{C}_A)(\frac{\pi}{2}) = 0$ and $\det(\mathcal{C}_A)(0) = -a^2 - b^2 \neq 0$ and again $\mathfrak{M}$ is not null Jordan Osserman. This completes the analysis in this setting.

3.7. **Type II models.** We take a direct approach to this case. Let $\mathfrak{M} = (V, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle, A)$ be a model of signature $(2,2)$, where A is a Type II algebraic curvature tensor. Then the analysis of [2, 11] shows there exists an orthonormal basis $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$ for V such that the non-vanishing components of A are

$$\begin{aligned}
&A_{1221} = A_{4334} = \pm\left(\alpha - \tfrac{1}{2}\right), \quad A_{1331} = A_{4224} = \mp\left(\alpha + \tfrac{1}{2}\right),\\
&A_{1441} = A_{3223} = -\beta, \quad A_{2113} = A_{2443} = \mp\tfrac{1}{2}, \quad A_{1224} = A_{1334} = \pm\tfrac{1}{2},\\
&A_{1234} = \left(\pm\left(-\alpha + \tfrac{3}{2}\right) + \beta\right)/3, \quad A_{1423} = 2(\pm\alpha - \beta)/3,\\
&A_{1342} = \left(\pm\left(-\alpha - \tfrac{3}{2}\right) + \beta\right)/3\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $u = e_2 - e_3$ and let $v = e_2 + e_3$. Then

$$\mathcal{J}_A(u) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta & \beta & 0 \\ 0 & -\beta & -\beta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad\text{and}\quad \mathcal{J}_A(v) = \begin{pmatrix} \pm 2 & 0 & 0 & \mp 2 \\ 0 & \beta & -\beta & 0 \\ 0 & \beta & -\beta & 0 \\ \pm 2 & 0 & 0 & \mp 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

If $\beta = 0$, then $r(u) = 0$ and $r(v) = 1$; if $\beta \neq 0$, then $r(u) = 1$ and $r(v) = 2$. Thus $\mathfrak{M}$ is not null Jordan Osserman.

3.8. **Type III models.** If $\mathfrak{M}$ is Type III, then there exists an orthonormal basis $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$ for V such that the non-vanishing components of A are (see [2, 11])

$$\begin{aligned}
&A_{1221} = A_{4334} = \alpha, \quad A_{1331} = A_{4224} = -\alpha, \quad A_{1441} = A_{3223} = -\alpha,\\
&A_{2114} = A_{2334} = -\sqrt{2}/2, \quad A_{3114} = -A_{3224} = \sqrt{2}/2,\\
&A_{1223} = A_{1443} = A_{1332} = -A_{1442} = \sqrt{2}/2.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $u = e_2 - e_3$ and $v = e_2 + e_3$. Then:

$$\mathcal{J}_A(u) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\sqrt{2} & -\sqrt{2} & 0 \\ -\sqrt{2} & \alpha & \alpha & \sqrt{2} \\ \sqrt{2} & -\alpha & -\alpha & -\sqrt{2} \\ 0 & -\sqrt{2} & -\sqrt{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \mathcal{J}_A(v) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha & -\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha & -\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It now follows that $r(u) = 2$ while $r(v) \leq 1$ and hence $\mathfrak{M}$ is not null Jordan Osserman. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3.

4. The proof of Theorem 1.5

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a null Jordan Osserman manifold of signature $(2,2)$. First note that, by Theorem 1.3, $\mathcal{M}$ has Type Ia. Results of [2] then show that $\mathcal{M}$ either (a) has constant sectional curvature, (b) is locally isometric to a complex space form, or (c) is locally isometric to a paracomplex space form. Since the curvature tensor of a paracomplex space form of constant paraholomorphic sectional curvature κ satisfies

$$R(x,y)z = \tfrac{\kappa}{4}\left\{R^0(x,y)z - R^J(x,y)z\right\};$$

this is ruled out by Theorem 1.3. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.5

Acknowledgments

Research of E. García-Río, M. E. Vázquez-Abal, and R. Vázquez-Lorenzo supported by projects MTM2006-01432 and PGIDIT06PXIB207054PR (Spain). Research of P. Gilkey partially supported by the Max Planck Institute in the Mathematical Sciences (Leipzig, Germany) and by Project MTM2006-01432 (Spain).

REFERENCES

[1] D. Alekseevsky, N. Blažić, N. Bokan, Z. Rakić; Self-duality and pointwise Osserman manifolds, *Arch. Math. (Brno)* **35** (1999), 193–201.

[2] N. Blažić, N. Bokan, Z. Rakić; Osserman pseudo-Riemannian manifolds of signature $(2, 2)$, *J. Aust. Math. Soc.* **71** (2001), 367–395.

[3] N. Blažić, N. Bokan, P. Gilkey; A note on Osserman Lorentzian manifolds, *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **29** (1997), 227–230.

[4] M. Brozos-Vázquez, P. Gilkey, S. Nikčević, U. Simon; Projectively Osserman manifolds, *to appear Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen*, see also http://arxiv.org/abs/0708.1210.

[5] Q. S. Chi; A curvature characterization of certain locally rank-one symmetric spaces, *J. Diff. Geom.* **28** (1988), 187–202.

[6] J. C. Díaz-Ramos, E. García-Río, R. Vázquez-Lorenzo; Four-dimensional Osserman metrics with nondiagonalizable Jacobi operators, *J. Geom. Anal.* **16** (2006), 39–52.

[7] J. C. Díaz-Ramos, E. García-Río, R. Vázquez-Lorenzo; New examples of Osserman metrics with nondiagonalizable Jacobi operators, *Differential Geom. Appl.* **24** (2006), 433–442.

[8] B. Fiedler; Determination of the structure of algebraic curvature tensors by means of Young symmetrizers, *Seminaire Lotharingien de Combinatoire* **B48d** (2003). 20 pp. Electronically published: http://www.mat.univie.ac.at/∼slc/; see also math.CO/0212278.

[9] E. García-Río, D. N. Kupeli, M. E. Vázquez-Abal; On a problem of Osserman in Lorentzian geometry, *Differential Geom. Appl.* **7** (1997), 85–100.

[10] E. García-Río, D. N. Kupeli, M. E. Vázquez-Abal, R. Vázquez-Lorenzo; Osserman affine connections and their Riemannian extensions, *Differential Geom. Appl.* **11** (1999), 145–153.

[11] E. García-Río, D. N. Kupeli, R. Vázquez-Lorenzo; *Osserman manifolds in semi-Riemannian geometry*, Lect. Notes Math. **1777**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 2002.

[12] E. García-Río, M. E. Vázquez-Abal, R. Vázquez-Lorenzo; Nonsymmetric Osserman pseudo-Riemannian manifolds, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **126** (1998), 2771–2778.

[13] E. García-Río, R. Vázquez-Lorenzo; Four-dimensional Osserman symmetric spaces, *Geom. Dedicata* **88** (2001), 147–151.

[14] P. Gilkey; *Geometric Properties of Natural Operators Defined by the Riemannian Curvature Tensor*, World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 2001.

[15] P. Gilkey, R. Ivanova; Spacelike Jordan Osserman algebraic curvature tensors in the higher signature setting, *Differential Geometry, Valencia, 2001*, 179–186, World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 2002.

[16] P. Gilkey, R. Ivanova; The Jordan normal form of Osserman algebraic curvature tensors, *Results Math.* **40** (2001), 192–204.

[17] A. Marden; *Outer circles. An introduction to hyperbolic 3-manifolds*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.

EGR, MEVA, AND RVL: DEPARTMENT OF GEOMETRY AND TOPOLOGY, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SANTIAGO DE COMPOSTELA, 15782 SANTIAGO DE COMPOSTELA, SPAIN
E-mail address: `xtedugr@usc.es, meva@zmat.usc.es, ravazlor@usc.es`

PG: MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OR 97403, USA AND MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE IN THE MATH. SCIENCES, LEIPZIG GERMANY
E-mail address: `gilkey@uoregon.edu`